

PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

***Arizona State University
Master of Education - Early Childhood Education
September 8, 2011***

Review Team

***Dr. Deborah J. Heiberger, Team Leader, Arizona Department
of Education***

Beth Driscoll, Arizona Department of Education

Dr. Donna Jurich, State Institution

Dr. Vicky Young, Private Institution

***Arizona Department of Education, 1535 W Jefferson,
Phoenix, Arizona 85007***



INTRODUCTION

Arizona State Board rule R7-2-604(A) states: The Board shall evaluate and may approve the professional preparation programs which request Board Approval. Rules R7-2-604 and R7-2-604.01 apply to all professional preparation programs in teacher, administrator, school guidance counselor, and school psychology programs that lead to certification. The Board may grant approval for a period not to exceed five years. A copy of Board rules governing the Professional Preparation Approval Process is attached to this document.

The professional preparation program review for **Arizona State University** was conducted on **September 8, 2011**. The following program was submitted for review: **Master of Education in Early Childhood Education**. Additional materials including the Field Experience Handbook and several online informational packets were submitted at Team request on September 19, 2011 to contribute to or clarify information identified in Team findings. This submission did not require a site visit. The Program Review Report is presented below.

Data Sources – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- ☐ Catalog and Addendum
- ☐ Institutional Self Study
- ☒ Course Syllabi
- ☐ Candidate Files
- ☒ Fieldwork Handbook
- ☐ Follow-up Survey Results
- ☒ Admission Materials
- ☒ Information Booklet
- ☐ Field Experience Notebook
- ☒ Schedule of Classes
- ☒ Advisement Documents
- ☐ Faculty Vitae

PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Program Name: Master of Education in Early Childhood Education

Program Description:

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

Submission materials clearly provide those elements necessary for this program to be evaluated as meeting Arizona provisional teacher certification requirements in Early Childhood Education.

It was noted that students are expected to take the AEPA prior to student teaching (page 8, Section C – Program of Study).

The Course Sequence as provided within submission materials (Appendix A2/175) was most helpful to reviewers in determining the coherence and how students would proceed through the program.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

***Please note that the Arizona State Board of Education is considering the adoption of the new Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards and is in transition in this matter as far as requiring program alignment to Arizona Professional Teacher Standards. The program currently under review, Arizona State University Master of Education in Early Childhood Education, will not be required to demonstrate alignment to Arizona Professional Teacher Standards, and the box within each section of this Review Report to be checked indicating this alignment will be left blank. The program will, however, be required to demonstrate alignment, at a minimum, to the National Association for Young Children (NAEYC) Standards within each Report section where this alignment is indicated.**

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

Recommendation(s):

The Team recommends that the Program specifically identify which AEPA test(s) (Subject/Content Knowledge and/or Professional Knowledge) the students are required to take prior to student teaching and clarify whether students are expected to not only take but pass the test(s) prior to student teaching.

If Unmet, further action required:

--

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
Alignment to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	*Please note that the new InTASC Standards are designated with a lower case “n” in the national materials and that this designation needs to be incorporated into this Program’s identification of InTASC alignment.
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

The format and contents of the Program syllabi are excellent models for teacher preparation programs. The syllabi are coherent and comprehensive in terms of critical curricular and programmatic features that will support faculty and students in the implementation and completion of this program. Further, it is important to note that this submission aligned program materials to the new InTASC Standards in addition to the NAEYC Standards.

It was noted that course ECD 505 Foundations of Early Childhood Education provided readings covering the “toddler” category, but not the full age range for ECE.

Course descriptions inconsistently identified the two age categories for ECE as: pre-K versus from birth to age 5/pre-K, “grade 3” versus grade 3/age 8, etc. Please see course descriptions for ECD Foundations of Education, ECD 525 Emergent Literacy, ECD 549 Foundations of Diversity, Human Development, and the Young Child, ECD 520 Child Guidance, and ECD 565 Appropriate Instructional Methodologies for Young Children.

ECD 503 Introduction to Research and Evaluation and ECD 593 Applied Project syllabi do not convey a focus on Early Childhood Education, or to one or both of the ECE age category designations, birth to age five/pre-k and k to grade three/age eight.

The two state-approved ELL courses leading to full SEI endorsement are not coded to NAEYC or the new InTASC Standards. They are currently coded to the Arizona Professional Teacher Standards.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

***Please note that the Arizona State Board of Education is considering the adoption of the new Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards and is in transition in this matter as far as requiring program alignment to Arizona Professional Teacher Standards. The program currently under review, Arizona State University Master of Education in Early Childhood Education, will not be required to demonstrate alignment to Arizona Professional Teacher Standards, and the box within each section of this Review Report to be checked indicating this alignment will be left blank. The program will, however, be required to demonstrate alignment, at a minimum, to the National Association for Young Children (NAEYC) Standards within each Report section where this alignment is indicated.**

Recommendation(s):

The Review Team strongly recommends referring the two age categories throughout all syllabi in the Program consistently as: birth to age 5/pre-K and K to age 8/grade 3. The use of the “pre-K” notation in ASU program materials for the “birth to age 5/pre-K “ age category is misleading and confusing to casual readers of the ASU ECE Program due to the “pre-K” designation’s usual use in Early Childhood Education documents and literature for that one year prior to kindergarten (K). It is recommended that, in future iterations of the ASU ECE Program, all syllabi consistently identify the two ECE age categories using the “birth to age 5/pre-K” designation and then the “K to age 8/ grade 3” designation.

While not required, consider 1) providing a focus on Early Childhood Education in ECD 503 and ECD 593 to strengthen program coherence for Early Childhood Education Program students, and 2) revising the two state-approved ELL courses that lead to Arizona full SEI endorsement so that they communicate their alignment with NAEYC and InTASC, and deleting the references to the outgoing Arizona Standards, and 3) enhancing the reading listing within ECD 505 Foundations of Early Childhood Education so that students are introduced to a broader age range representative of Early Childhood Education, rather than just toddlers.

If Unmet, further action required:

--

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Signature assignments are identified within course syllabi in narrative and as noted on the course assignment matrices, and the expectations for completion/artifacts are aligned with evidence on the Program Matrix.

Values assigned to signature assignments vary, such as ECD 520 value 20/110 (Appendix A page 43), ECD 525 10/220, and ECD 527 25/200.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the descriptions for the signature assignments be reviewed across Program syllabi so that greater consistency in the degree of detail within the descriptions might be achieved with prominent criteria for completion consistently identified.

It is strongly recommended that the stated point value of each signature assignment be such that successful completion of the course signature assignment is required by the instructor in order for students to pass the course. Point value for signature assignments, for example, might be determined to be at least 51% of the total points available, or a statement might be included on each syllabus that students must successfully

complete the signature assignment in order to pass the course.

If Unmet, further action required:

--

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The Program signature assignment rubrics and scoring tools as presented through course syllabi and additional Program materials are focused on student demonstrations of content mastery, aligned with standards and evidence on the Program Matrix. The rubrics and scoring tools are comprehensive and detailed, and easily applicable to assignments and anticipated artifacts.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

If Unmet, further action required:

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition (“scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience”) ARS R7-2-604 Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone) Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The Field Experience Handbook did not accompany the initial submission of the Program. Some early findings of the Review Team resulted from the absence of this important document. A review of the Handbook, following its receipt on September 19, 2011, enabled the reviewers to answer their own questions about this aspect of the Program and served to clarify some earlier informational confusion. For example, in Appendix B page 9/18, there was some confusion regarding the language “intern” versus “student” (see first bullet). The Team was unable to determine for whom the information had been written. Similar confusion was found on pages 3/18, 4/18, and 17/18, as the Team reviewed the role definitions for “mentor teacher,” “cooperating teacher,” and “placement mentor teacher.” The use of the acronym, “ITC,” meaning Initial Teacher Certification,” without explanation and in the absence of the Field Experience Handbook, was initially confusing within the submission materials. The Field Experience Handbook as reviewed is a comprehensive, detailed, and well-prepared document.

It was evident throughout the review of submission materials that sound processes have been developed and documented to ensure appropriate and diverse placements for field experiences and for following the students through to completion of the field experiences.

It was noted that the master listing of field experience placements contained information on placements also at the middle and high school levels (Appendix c, page 7/18).

Criteria for “diversity” varied within information presented in Section B page 5 to page 6.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

It is particularly important for the successful and thorough review of any (predominantly) online professional preparation program, that key documents such as the Field Experience Handbook posted online for faculty and students be provided on disc or in hard copy with other materials as part of the initial submission. This enables the Review Team to achieve accurate and more comprehensive information about the program under review.

The provision of a glossary relative to specific acronyms used by the institution would facilitate the work of outside reviewers.

Consider using consistent institutional criteria for determining the definition of diversity.

If Unmet, further action required:

--

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

Field Experience rubrics provided for the birth to age 5/pre-K age category presented the same criteria as those provided for the K through age 8/grade 3 category. Rubric expectations are not currently differentiated. The materials provided generally convey across syllabi and rubrics that the Program is more heavily developed or weighted for the K through age 8/grade 3 group of young learners.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

***Please note that the Arizona State Board of Education is considering the adoption of the new Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards and is in transition in this matter insofar as far as requiring program alignment to Arizona Professional Teacher Standards. The program currently under review, Arizona State University Master of Education in Early Childhood Education, will not be required to demonstrate alignment to Arizona Professional Teacher Standards, and the box within each section of this Review Report to be checked indicating this alignment will be left blank. The program will, however, be required to demonstrate alignment, at a minimum, to the National Association for Young Children (NAEYC) Standards within each Report section where this alignment is indicated.**

Recommendation(s):

Sharpen the focus of the Early Childhood Education Program student-mastery expectations as they pertain to the two required age categories by differentiating the levels, specific content, and skills of student performance for each age category.

Examine and consider carefully the design and student mastery expectations for the birth to age 5/pre-K age category in relation to the student-mastery expectations for the K to age 8/grade 3 age category as conveyed by the current field experience rubrics, so that the birth to age 5/pre-K field experiences provide a depth and scope for that age category commensurate with (balanced with) the experience expectations presented for the K to age 8/grade 3 category.

If Unmet, further action required:

--

STUDENT TEACHING

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒

Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The Team noted that in Section B page 14/18, the Arizona Professional Teacher and NAEYC Standards are referenced in the discussion of the Student Teacher Evaluation Process, but not the InTASC Standards. The Team was aware that ASU is working to shift standards alignment to the InTASC Standards throughout their teacher preparation materials.

Many of the narrative and form materials reviewed were aligned with the Arizona Professional Teacher Standards and will need to be realigned with InTASC Standards. For examples, see Section B pages 14, and 16, Section C page 9, and Handbook page 19-20.

The processes relative to implementation of the student teaching component of the Program were clarified during the review of the Field Experience Handbook and hard copies of the online presentations about "Planning to Student Teach" received on September 19, 2011. Initial confusion over information sharing and the roles and responsibilities of the student, cooperating teacher, and University supervisor was addressed.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Review all Program online and hard copy student teaching materials, narrative, presentations, Handbook, etc., and ensure that the shift to InTASC Standards is presented in a consistent and comprehensive manner.

If Unmet, further action required:

--

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENT TEACHING

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards

Met ☐ Unmet ☐ N/A

Evaluation instrument tied to national standards

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Please refer to findings and recommendations above pertaining to standards alignment.

The Team identified and brought recognition to the original formatting, and exemplary organization and presentation of student teaching instrumentation.

Receipt of the Student Teaching Handbook on September 19, 2011 as additional supportive review information served to clarify Team questions pertaining to references to "Blackboard" information, and role responsibilities especially relating to the oversight of students placed at "distant" sites.

The Team felt that the processes and instrumentation for student teaching implementation, evaluation, and record-keeping more heavily addressed the age category K to age 8/grade 3.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604(C) (2): Provide the Department with a description of the field experience and capstone experience policies for the program being considered for Board approval. The review team shall verify that the field experience or capstone experience complies with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and relevant national standards.

***Please note that the Arizona State Board of Education is considering the adoption of the new Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards and is in transition in this matter insofar as far as requiring program alignment to Arizona Professional Teacher Standards. The program currently under review, Arizona State University Master of Education in Early Childhood Education, will not be required to demonstrate alignment to Arizona Professional Teacher Standards, and the box within each section of this Review Report to be checked indicating this alignment will be left blank. The program will, however, be required to demonstrate alignment, at a minimum, to the National Association for Young Children (NAEYC) Standards within each Report section where this alignment is indicated.**

Recommendation(s):

The Team strongly recommends that the narrative pertaining to student teaching processes and implementation, as well as all student teaching evaluation instrumentation, be divided such that expectations and criteria give distinct emphasis to both age categories in Early Childhood Education.

Additionally, and as stated earlier, the Team recommends that ASU review all Program online and hard copy student teaching materials, narrative, presentations, Handbook, instrumentation, etc., and ensure that the shift away from AZPTS to NAEYC and InTASC Standards is presented in a consistent and comprehensive manner.

If Unmet, further action required:

--

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified.	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 1	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 2	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 3	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 4	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 5	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 6	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 7	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 8	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Standard 9 (Special Education programs only)	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Findings of the Team:

The Team determined that the Program Matrix was well-developed and comprehensive in terms of accurately representing the expectations of the program as conveyed by the Program syllabi. One exception to this desired alignment was the appearance on the Matrix of the ELL coursework (see ELL 515 Syllabus page 81/175, for example, which conveys the sole alignment of the course to the Arizona Professional Teacher Standards and Section E page 4/18 – Program Matrix, within which ELL artifacts are identified in column three for InTASC Standard 3).

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

As addressed earlier in this Review Report, ASU should revise and submit for re-approval by the state the two state-approved ELL courses that lead to full SEI endorsement so that they communicate the alignment with NAEYC and InTASC Standards. Until that is accomplished, it is

recommended that references to field experiences and artifacts resultant from student completion of the ELL courses be removed from the Program Matrix.

If Unmet, further action required:

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

An Assessment Plan is provided within the submission materials for the Program.
Materials identify two different assessment systems, either in use or to be used by 2012. The Team was unable to determine which (or both) would be a part of the overall Assessment Plan for this Program.
The explanatory language provided in Section D on page 8/8 referencing the grant expiring in 2010 and used for maintaining T-PREP needs to be revised to reflect current information and processes.
Data are not yet available.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Clarify, within Program materials, which of the two assessment systems is to be used during implementation of the Program.
Review submission materials to update narrative, such as that referenced above.
In Section C page 11, reflect on and clarify the purposes of formative versus summative assessment.

If Unmet, further action required:

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

The Team wishes to compliment Arizona State University for the overall quality of this Program submission. The Program syllabi convey (as a whole) a clear understanding at the University of a comprehensive standards-aligned, performance-based program of study. The Team recognizes the initiative of the University in making great strides with the preparation of this current submission to incorporate the new InTASC Standards.

As part of the continuous program improvement process, several recommendations provided throughout the Report are intended to assist the institution. These include:

- That the Program specifically identifies which AEPA test(s) (Subject/Content Knowledge and/or Professional Knowledge) the students are required to take prior to student teaching and clarify whether students are expected to not only take but pass the test(s) prior to student teaching.
- That the institution refer to the two age categories throughout all syllabi in the Program consistently as: birth to age 5/pre-K and K to age 8/grade 3. The use of the “pre-K” notation in ASU program materials for the “birth to age 5/pre-K “ age category is misleading and confusing to casual readers of the ASU ECE Program due to the “pre-K” designation’s usual use in Early Childhood Education documents and literature for that one year prior to kindergarten (K). It is recommended that, in future iterations of the ASU ECE Program, all syllabi consistently identify the two ECE age categories using the “birth to age 5/pre-K” designation and then the “K to age 8/ grade 3” designation.
- Consider providing a focus on Early Childhood Education in ECD 503 and ECD 593 to strengthen program coherence for Early Childhood Education Program students,
- Revise the two state-approved ELL courses that lead to Arizona full SEI endorsement so that they communicate their alignment with NAEYC and InTASC, and deleting the references to the outgoing Arizona Standards.
- Enhance the reading listing within ECD 505 Foundations of Early Childhood Education so that students are introduced to a broader age range representative of Early Childhood Education, rather than just toddlers.
- That the stated point value of each signature assignment be such that successful completion of the course signature assignment be required by the instructor in order for students to pass the course. Point value for signature assignments, for example, might be determined to be at least 51% of the total points available, or a statement might be included on each syllabus that students must successfully complete the signature assignment in order to pass the course.
- Consider using consistent institutional criteria for determining the definition of diversity.
- Sharpen the focus of the Early Childhood Education Program student-mastery expectations as they pertain to the two required age categories by differentiating the levels, specific content, and skills of student performance for each age category. Examine and consider carefully the design and student mastery expectations for the birth to age 5/pre-K age category in relation to the student-mastery expectations for the K to age 8/grade 3 age category as conveyed by the current field experience rubrics, so that the birth to age 5/pre-K

field experiences provide a depth and scope for that age category commensurate with (balanced with) the experience expectations presented for the K to age 8/grade 3 category. That the narrative pertaining to student teaching processes and implementation, as well as all student teaching evaluation instrumentation, be divided such that expectations and criteria give distinct emphasis to both age categories in Early Childhood Education.

- Clarify, within Program materials, which of the two assessment systems is to be used during implementation of the Program.
- (In Section C page 11), reflect on and clarify the purposes of formative versus summative assessment.
- Review submission materials to ensure that narrative explanations are up-to-date.
- Review all Program online and hard copy student teaching materials, narrative, presentations, Handbook, etc., and ensure that the shift to InTASC Standards is presented in a consistent and comprehensive manner.